



Atty. Docket No.: 10050-102
Appl. Ser. No.: 09/633,330

ⓔ
#5/a
2-18-04

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on February 9, 2004.

Jacob N. Erlich

Jacob N. Erlich
Reg. No. 24,338

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	H. John Caulfield	Examiner:	Virginia M. KIBLER
Serial No:	09/633,330	Art Unit:	2623
Filed:	August 7, 2000	Confirmation No.:	3407
For:	A METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR IMPROVING PATTERN RECOGNITION SYSTEM PERFORMANCE		

PERKINS, SMITH & COHEN, LLP
One Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 854-4000

RECEIVED

To: Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FEB 17 2004
Technology Center 2600

RESPONSE (A) TO OFFICE ACTION PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §1.111

Sir:

This amendment is being provided in response to the (non-final) Office Action dated October 8, 2003, for the above-captioned U.S. patent application. A petition for a one-month extension and the associated small entity fee are provided herewith. No additional fees are believed necessary for submission and consideration of this paper. In the event that additional extensions of time are necessary, such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required for consideration of this amendment are authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 03-2410, Order No. 10050-102.

The Abstract was objected to as exceeding 150 words. Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the application. Claims 3 and 7-15 were objected to as containing informalities requiring

correction. Claims 1, 3-4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico¹ in view of Lyon². Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon in further view of Akiyama³. Claims 5-6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon in further view of Straforini⁴. Claims 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon and Straforini in further view of Akiyama. Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Errico and Lyon in further view of Watanabe⁵. Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg⁶ in view of Filipski⁷. Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Filipski and further in view of Watanabe.

Through the Amendments and the Remarks that follow, the objections to the Abstract and claims, and the rejections of claims 1-17 noted above are overcome. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

¹ U.S. Patent No. 5,796,924 to Errico, *et al.*

² U.S. Patent No. 5,903,884 to Lyon, *et al.*

³ U.S. Patent No. 5,602,938 to Akiyama, *et al.*

⁴ U.S. Patent No. 6,092,059 to Straforini, *et al.*

⁵ U.S. Patent No. 5,754,681 to Watanabe, *et al.*

⁶ U.S. Patent No. 3,993,976 to Ginsburg, Arthur P.

⁷ U.S. Patent No. 4,975,975 to Filipski, Alan